

Unifed States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/038,409 | 01/03/2002 | Michael Allen Yudkowsky | 42390p13063 | 7057 |
| 8791 | 7590 05/19/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN | | | ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A | |
| 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | , | | 2654 | 5 |
| | | DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Applicati | on No. | cant(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| • | 10/038,4 | 09 | YUDKOWSKY, MICHAEL ALLEN | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examine | | Art Unit | | | |
| , " | Angela A. | Armstrong | 2654 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | 01 March 2004 | | | | | |
| , | This action is r | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for a | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction | ithdrawn from co | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | · | 4) Intoniou Summer- | (PTO.412) | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Paper No(s)/Mail Date | • | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | | | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) | ffice Action Summa | ry | Part of Paper No./Mail Date 5 | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1-12 and 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goronzy et al (EP 1022725 A1).

Goronzy discloses a system for the selection of acoustic models using speaker verification.

2. Regarding claim 1, Goronzy discloses determining an identity of a speaker through a network over which output data, including identification information, is provided to one or more speech-recognition systems, at col. 3, lines 1-9 and 35-46, since the networked system (col. 3, lines 2-3) checks the identity of the speaker every time the speaker changes, which requires use of some form of identification information to output to the verification module (4). Additionally, Goronzy discloses attempting to locate, based on the identity of the speaker, a voice model for speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; and retrieving from a storage area the voice model for the speaker if the voice model for the speaker is located, at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 2, Goronzy discloses the voice model comprises a speaker dependent voice model at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4, line 2.



Art Unit: 2654

Regarding claim 3, Goronzy discloses wherein determining the identity of the speaker over the network comprises using identification information received from the speaker over the network to determine the identity of the speaker, at col. 3, line 1 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 4, Goronzy discloses receiving from a device in the network identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2; determining the identity of the speaker based on the identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 5, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an internal storage area containing speaker-dependent voice models for multiple persons, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 6, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an external storage area accessible over the network, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 7, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise phonemes, at col. 3, line 39.

Regarding claim 8, Goronzy discloses receiving an utterance from the speaker at col. 3, lines 39-43; using the voice model to extract phonemes from the utterance at col. 3, lines 39-52; and transmitting the phonemes over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 9, Goronzy discloses wherein the utterance comprises one or both of the vocalized words and vocalized sounds, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 10, Goronzy discloses receiving from the speech recognition system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 43-58; revising the voice model



Art Unit: 2654

for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 11, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise a voice model for the speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 12, Goronzy discloses further comprising transmitting the voice model over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 53-58.

Regarding claim 14, Goronzy discloses retrieving a speaker-independent voice model if failing to locate the voice model for the speaker, at col. 4, lines 30-40; receiving an utterance from the speaker, at col. 4, lines 19-21; using the speaker-independent voice model to extract phonemes from the utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; transmitting the phonemes over the network to a speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 43-52; receiving from the speech-recognition system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 46-58 and col. 4, lines 17-40; and generating a voice model for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized utterance, at col. 4, lines 17-40.

Regarding claims 15-30 claims 15-30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1-12 and 14 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goronzy in view of
 Ellis et al, "Tandem Acoustic Modeling in Large Vocabulary Recognition", (ICASSP '01).
 2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2001
 Proceedings, vol. 1, pages 517-520.
- 4. Regarding claim 13, Goronzy does not specifically teach implementation of Aurora feature extraction. However, implementation of Aurora features was well known in the art.

In a similar field of endeavor, Ellis teaches a system of tandem acoustic modeling in a large vocabulary recognition system, and specifically describes the advantages of using Aurora data in a recognition system since the system involves recognizing data in a wide range of noisy backgrounds.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Goronzy to implement Aurora feature processing, for the purpose of providing a recognition system that is able to recognize data in noisy backgrounds, as taught by Ellis.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2654

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela A. Armstrong Examiner Art Unit 2654

AAA May 16, 2004

RICHEMOND DORVIL